Ms. Hina King, editor
Book World
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

4/20/95

Dear Ms. King,

I write this not hoping for publication of it but in the hope it will not be a futile effort to get you to rethink an attitude reflected in what you publish that results in indulging prejudice if not worse, dishonesty. It certainly results in misleading the people and that frustrates the working of democratic society.

Selecting Richard Gid Powers to review Red ~~Mass sacre, same~~ Scare assured a very prejudiced and I believe dishonest review. For him not to do that would be asking him to write a review contrary to the preconcepetion reflected in his own ~~titl~~ subtitle, "The History of American Anticommunism."

Most of those he denigrates were not and never had been Communists. Most were the victims of hysteria. Most of the hysteria had a political objective that is contrary to the most basic of American political belief, the basis for creating this country and its concepts of freedom and what democratic society requires.

Much of Powers' diatribe and political essay is devoted to denouncing the USSR. That has nothing to do with whether or not there was an inquisition. And what he really does is what you should have anticipated in selecting him for that review, seek to justify what cannot be justified in any decent society. One example of which it just happens the Post did wonderfully well and honestly with in its magazine of the same issue, the John Fairbanks case.

That not atypical case also illusrates what the professional exploits and of our tragic history avoid, the enormous harm done to our contry by denying it the services of those fine and informed minds who were victimized and who feared seeking government employment because of fear they would be victimized. The great tragdies were suffered in Asia because the policies of those who did the victimization prevailed is but one illustration. One purpose and certainly one result was to control American policy with terrible tragedies coming from that. It assured that there would be no questioning of their policies that have since been proven to be wrong and terribly, terribly costly in many ways.

Here are some reflections of Powers open bias:

"... the full wonder of the veneration he (~~powers~~ Fariello) accords these 'victims' of American anticommunism..."

By what rational standard, assuming the rest is faithful to Fariello's book, can it be implied that they were not victims?

"...the blacklisted Hollywood screenwriters (which by the way, all were not), have gotten more mileage from their predicament than other writers got from a beer with ~~Hemmy~~

hemmingway." Starvation, jobless "mileage" in them and their families.

That "mileage" was what they wanted? It did them any good? It was on their initiative? It is a fair or an honest way of referring to them? Or to what happened to them? Or to those who did it? Particularly Martin Dies?

Diminishing the terrible things done by J. Edgar Hoover by refering to them as "evil spells" that only the victims to whom he refers disparagingly as "the enlightened elect" who alone"can perceive the truth," Powers says that this, "unfortunetly, was the recourse of almost all leftists (sic) interviewed by Fariello. As a result of their proud certitude there is little insight here."

What in the world can reasonably be expected of those were were really the victims, and that in a blatant departure from all basic American concepts, including of our Constitution? Most of whom were not communists in any event.

Powers refers to the "moral validity of the case agains comminism," which that sad period of our history was not, "by allowing its defenders to bask in victimhood in a culture that has come increasingly to regard victimization as a blanket absolution for all middeeds."

This is truly outrageous! Shame on you for publishing it!

Their persecution had nothing at all to do with "validating the case against communism."

Whatever Powers may have meant by "bask in the rectitude of victimhood," which none sought, and "bask" yet after what happened to them. Power also assumes misdeeds by them, and that is straightout dishonest. Nobody was fired or blacklisted for any "misdeeds."

How can this last quotation from his propaganda guised as a review be other than his effort to defend himself and his writing, a be justified:

"... it would have been wise for Fariello to acknowledge that the moral stance of his 'victims of the American inquisition' is not above all reproach."

Fariello's subtitle could not have been more fully descriptive of his approach. And what is it is actual the position of those or in what they did or said that should be reproached? What is wrong with the "moral stance" that they were victimized by those of the anti-American mindeset of those like Powers who exploit and commercialize it?

Inherent in this gross and disgusting dishonesty is the assumption that all those people were criminals of one kind or another and were a great danger to this country and its institutions. That was not so. The danger was from those who persecuted them then and from the Powerses of today. Who do not believe in the wisdom of those great men who were our founding fathers or in the institutions they created or the rights they established or the limitations they placed on government.

Dalton Trumbo, who won Oscars under assumed names after he was blacklisted, needed

that imagined "mileage" Powers refers to with such indecency?

Arthur Miller was a "leftist," which Powers uses as synonymous with Communist, who wrapped hims in "fact -proof certitude" and his persecutors, like Martin Dies, were not the real danger to the country ?

Pete Seeger and Linus Pauling were a menace to the country and its institutions and the House Un Americans were not? Or Fairbanks? Or Service and others?

You have edited your section with a consistent bias in support or errant government and that is not the way to inform people so they can participate in government and it is not the way the press should bring to light government error.

As a personal experience of which I never complained to you or to the Post, you hae reviewed books that support the official JFK assassination but not those that do not. The most recent case was the large attention you gave Gerald Posenr's outrageously dishonest and knowingly misitled Case Closed while refusing to review my exposure of it, Case Open. (About which I've had not a peep of complaint from him or his publisher- who is one of your major advertisers - or froma an lawyer speaking for either. Nor did he have a single complaint in what he added to his paperback reprint. Or any denial or refutation

My eighth book on the JFK assassination is due to appear this month. The Post has yet to review any one of them. And the fact is that they are the basic books on the subject. I've not had a letter or a call from any of the hundreds of whom I write critically complaining of either unfair treatment of incorrectness. And the Department of Justice itself, representing the FBI in one of my many FOIA lawsuits, ~~to~~ told the court in one that I know more about the JFK assassination than anyone working for the FBI.

So what else disqualifies my books for reviewing? Other than what they say.

If you lived through those days of hysteria as I did, if you saw that the hysteria was initiated by and pursued by those of authoritarain mind and belief who wanted to change our form of givernment and to a degree did, who persecuted those who believed in democracy as they did not, would you not have commissioned any Powers and you certainly would not have published any such dishonest, unfair and propagandizing "review."

So intendedly hurtful to those authentic victims and to their families.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg

Because my typing cannot be any better, and I do apologize for it, when I can I let it wait for a while hoping there will be less confabulation when I read and correct it. In that time I decided to add a little more because I doubt you were aware of what was happening to us in those years.

All those firings were under laws since found to be unConstitutional, as they so obviously were on enactment and on enforcement. But it was for most legislators political suicide to oppose them. Some were not even laws in the usual sense. ~~There was~~ authored that Ameriform nazi Pat McCarran of Nevada. He had riders attached to bills that could not be vetoed. I was fired under one of them. That rider permitted certain agencies, like State, where I'd been transferred with that part of the OSS, to fire anyone at any time without any reason existing, stated or needed and without charges, hearings of appeals. That is Americanism? Other than to the Powerses who live by using that approach?

In the division in which I worked were four of the ten thus fired in the first major "security" case that was no such thing at all. The other three were eminent scholars, two proteges of Margaret Mead. My job was to do what the learned and the intellectuals could not do. All four of us were Jews. No accident.

I got them to agree for me to get us counsel. I got Thurman Arnold, who had known me when he headed anti-trust in Justice and I took him all my research for a magazine series on Nazi cartels. That was, by the way, during what was known as the "shibboleth" priod of the Nazi-Soviet pact. And at the suggestion of one of his assistance I had violated the law and become an unregistered British agent in economic warfare. I'd known Paul ~~Poor~~ Porter a little after he left the FCC where I believe he had been a commissioner. I did not know Abe Fortas. ~~So you can see then~~ They were the partners in that then young firm that defended us.

One of them intdrested the Republican owner of the Republican New Hork Herald-Tribune in this as a story. She assigned her Washington Bureau chief, Bert Andrews to it. He did a series of which the Post published at least one, the one in which J. Edgar Hoover told him there was nothing at all on any of us. I was not mentioned in it because I'd had no hearing he could cite, having had no charges made at all.

When the Andrews series was published State was so embarrassed it made a deal with our lawyers to rehire us-with an public apology - and then we resigned. Andrews made that series into a book and it got the Pulitzer.

Of the ten, nigh were Jews. The other was a case of mistaken identity! A man was fired by mistake! Instead on an anti-Communist woman with whom I worked. Her sin was that she did not like the Peron dictatorship in Argentina and did not color her research to make him look better.

We were all Latin Americanists. The Amerinazis in State "security" and in the House blackmailed George Marshall to agree to the firings. The chairman of the House appropri-

iations committee was in the ideal spot to do that, and he did. Within State the activist honcho in "security" was John Peurifoy. And five years later he was ambassador to Guatemala and part of the overthrow of the democratically elected government.

Does the current news about Guatemala suggest anything to you?

It did not happen there alone in Guatemala and the people who brought it to pass did not want any honest research and intelligence reaching policy makers. So they trumped up a phony "security" case under a McCarran rider and got rid of their ideologues' problem that way,

I don't think you want more and I do not want to spend more time on this. I can also tell you more about the Edward Daytryk so noble a man to Powers. In my contact with him he was not at all noble. He doublecrossed his companions in that awful thing. The conditions under which he came to see me do suggest that he was a Communist. What he then did suggests that that is when he stopped being one.

It is bad enough when out government debases and violates every American principle but it is, I think, worse for that to be portrayed as other than it was and for Americans to have their minds and their understanding of our system corrupted by those who find the violation of american belief and concepts of freedom a means of making a living and achieving a little fame.

In all of which you became a participant and made that contribution to it possible.

I sincereny hope this was not your intention.

HW

ARNOLD, FORTAS & PORTER
1200 EIGHTEENTH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

THURMAN ARNOLD
ABE FORTAS
PAUL A. PORTER
WALTON HAMILTON
MILTON V. FREEMAN
NORMAN DIAMOND
REED MILLER
L. A. NIKOLORIC

TELEPHONE
DISTRICT 3251

November 28, 1947

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

We want you to know how deeply we appreciate your kind and generous gesture in sending us a gift and the warm sentiments which accompanied it. You know it was a pleasure to be of service to you and your own calmness and dignity under the most adverse circumstances were in no small measure responsible for your ultimate vindication.

Sincerely,

Thurman Arnold

Abe Fortas

Paul A. Porter

Milton V. Freeman

Mr. Harold Weisberg
2322 N. Nottingham
Arlington, Virginia